DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 459 FL 007 132

AUTHOR Filipovic, Rudolf
TITLE A Contribution to the Method of Studying Anglicisms in European Languages.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 16p.
JOURNAL CIT Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia; n37 p135-148 1974

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Bilingualism; *Contrastive Linguistics; *Cross Cultural Studies; *Cultural Exchange; *Culture Contact; English; Finno Ugric Languages; Modern Languages; Romance Languages; Slavic Languages; *Synchronic Linguistics
IDENTIFIERS Anglicisms; Germanic Languages; *Linguistic Borrowing

ABSTRACT

Language contact and word borrowing can best be studied in the behavior of bilingual speakers. To establish the universals in language contact and borrowing we must work on a rich and representative corpus. English will be the only lending language, and various European languages the receivers. To narrow the corpus, certain characteristics are singled out. A language qualifies if it has any category in its structure not found in English, or if it lacks one English has. In addition, languages are selected as being most typical and least typical of the Germanic, Romance, Slavic and Finno-Ugric groups. Intensity and length of contact with English are possible criteria; French and Dutch are two with long-time contact. A young language such as Macedonian may be included since its development can be easily traced. Albanian and Turkish would be included because, among other reasons, they are the only representatives in Europe of their groups. Irish and Welsh are excluded because their subordinate relationship with English is unique. English borrowings may be direct or through an intermediary, and may be oral or written. English often serves as an intermediary language for words from other parts of the world to enter European languages. (CHK)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

To the Library of CAL

ED119459

FACULTAS PHILOSOPHICA UNIVERSITATIS STUDIORUM
ZAGRABIENSIS

RUDOLF FILIPOVIĆ

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE METHOD OF STUDYING ANGLICISMS IN EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia, 37/1974

FL00 7132

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Rudolf Filipović

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

ZAGREB
FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET
ULICA Đ. SALAJA 3

Rudolf Filipović

A Contribution to the Method of Studying Anglicisms in European Languages

1.0. *Introduction.* It is well known in linguistics that languages which serve the cultural needs of a community often adopt foreign names for new objects and concepts that they have taken over from other language communities. These new words are adapted to the structure of the language receiving them. This process of adaptation and integration into the receiving language, with the changes that it entails, can be studied linguistically.

1.1. The study of foreign words in languages has been approached from various points of view, explained in different ways, and given different names. Traditional linguistics spoke of *language mixing* or *borrowing*, and attributed a significant role to bilingualism in explaining it.[1] Modern linguistics, though it gives this phenomenon the new name *languages in contact*,[2] starts out from the same fundamental idea: that bilingualism is the basis for linguistic borrowing. All the phenomena that appear in the linguistic process of taking elements from one language into another can best be studied in the behaviour of bilingual speakers.

1.2. Since *linguistic interference* is a fundamental phenomenon which appears in the transition from one structure to another, the first task of a linguist studying foreign words is to analyze all the deviations from the norm which appear as a result of the contact of two or more languages. This in practice means

[1] R. Filipović: "Jezici u kontaktu i jezično posuđivanje" (Languages in contact and linguistic borrowing). Uvod — Povijesni pregled (Introduction — Historical Survey), *Suvremena lingvistika*, 4, Zagreb, 1967, 27—89. and *Kontakti jezika u teoriji i praksi* (Language contacts in theory and practice), Zagreb, 1971, pp. 91—103.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 37 and p. 97.

to identify and describe all the cases of interference. Interference appears at all linguistic levels and in various forms. It can be spontaneous or deliberate. Since it can appear in any part of the language, it must be studied in terms of the structure of the borrowing language.

1.3. Linguistic theory has devoted much attention to language contact phenomena. Contacts of related and unrelated languages have been studied, in many different ways, but most often considering interference on only one level at a time, and between only two languages. These individual studies, however solid and detailed, have left many questions open concerning the principles of linguistic borrowing.

2.0. *The Corpus.* Previous investigations have shown that the study of certain questions in the field of languages in contact can successfully be carried out on a corpus of two languages.[3] Nevertheless, formulation and explanation of general principles require an expanded corpus involving more languages. For example, defining the neglected concept of *phonetic compromise,*[4] and particularly the problem of *phonemic importation,*[5] hitherto formulated only in general terms, certainly calls for a multilingual corpus, that is, a corpus of examples of contacts of several different languages. This is especially necessary if we seek to discover what is universal in all instances when two languages come in contact.

2.1. To establish all the universals in language contact, and discover the universal regularities in linguistic borrowing, we must work on a very rich and highly representative corpus. So the formation of such a corpus would represent the first problem in our work.

2.2. If, however, we narrow the goals of our study to cover only one lending language, the corpus problem becomes much

---

[3] *Cf.*: Leo Papp, *Portuguese-American Speech*, New York, 1949; Einar Haugen, *The Norwegian Language in America*, I—II, 1953; Uriel Weinreich, *Languages in Contact*, New York, 1953. I used a bilingual corpus when I examined the verbal aspect of English loan-words in Serbo-Croatian (*Cf.*: "Principi lingvističkog posuđivanja II — Morfološki aspekt" [Principles of linguistic borrowing II — Morphological aspect], *Filološki pregled*, Beograd, 1966, IV, 1—2, pp. 9—13)], and some problems of the change of meaning of English loan-words in Serbo-Croatian ["Semantic Extension Changes in Adaptation of English Loan-Words in Serbo-Croatian", *SRAZ*, 25—26, Zagreb, 1968, pp. 109—119]).

[4] R. Filipović, "The Phonetic Compromise", *SRAZ*, 5, Zagreb, 1958, pp. 77—88.

[5] R. Filipović, "Phonemic Importation", *SRAZ*, 9—10, Zagreb, 1960, pp. 177—189.

less onerous. That is, the study of foreign elements would be limited to only one sort, for example *Anglicisms, Romanisms,* or *Germanisms.* In this way the relations between the *lending* and *borrowing languages* would be simplified: English would be the only lending language.

2.3. Nor should the set of borrowing languages remain open and undefined. Their number will be determined by the purposes of the study.

2.3.1. One possibility would be to study the English element in a large set of languages like the Indo-European family. Though this might seem theoretically justified, there are many reasons not to propose such a voluminous and complicated analysis.

2.3.2. Another possibility is to study elements from one lending language in one branch of the Indo-European family. In this case, however, the linguistic characteristics of this branch might show up too clearly in the results, which would thus lose universal validity.

2.4. If several branches of a large language family provide the conditions for being grouped together, we could adopt a compromise solution: we would avoid too large a corpus, containing many languages which at their present state of development do not have enough features in common to justify inclusion in a corpus for our purposes. We would also avoid the other extreme, a corpus made up of only one group of languages, too homogeneous for us to be able to establish universals.

2.4.1. The middle way will be to take several branches which have some connection, even a merely formal one. This connection can be geographical: belonging to one *geographical unit* (one continent) and thus forming a whole. Such a narrowing of the set of receiving languages shows several positive elements which justify choosing the set on a geographical basis.

2.4.2. In the study of Anglicisms, the European continent seems very favourable as the basis for forming the set of receiving languages to be studied, since it has cultural continuity as well as geographical. The languages' direct and indirect contacts with English have been intense and frequent enough for easy analysis.

2.4.3. A corpus composed of European languages provides sufficient variety in linguistic systems, since it includes several

strong language families (Romance, Germanic, Slavic) and a number of languages representing smaller groups (e. g. Finno-Ugric). Individual languages (e. g. Albanian, Basque, Turkish) within Europe are varied enough to allow testing certain phenomena on quite different receiving-language structures. Hence, a corpus formed on a geographical basis such as the continent of Europe is favourable material for the study of universal features and regularities in linguistic borrowing or languages in contact.

2.5. But even this compromise approach gives a very extensive corpus in terms of number of languages. The number of languages in a corpus is not always proportional to the corpus's representativeness. The representativeness of a corpus for foreign-word studies depends not on the number of languages included, but on the variety of their systems and structures. Hence, in order to formulate the main principles of English borrowings in European languages, it is theoretically unnecessary, and practically scarcely feasible, to investigate the English element in each separate European language. This means that it is desirable to reduce the number of languages further, but without reducing the representativeness of the corpus or the possibilities for establishing universals of language contact.

2.6. The usefulness of a corpus for investigating Anglicisms in European languages will, thus, not be measured by the number of languages included, but by the characteristics of their systems. In choosing the languages, we will start out from English, the lending language. A language qualifies for inclusion if at any level of its structure it possesses a category not found in English, or lacks one that English has. For instance, a Slavic language which has in its system the category of verbal aspect, lacking in English, thereby qualifies for inclusion in the corpus.

2.6.1. If the same category exists in both languages, the lender (English) and the borrower (language X), then there are two possibilities. If the category is identical in both languages, language X does not get a positive point towards inclusion. But if the category in language X is different from that in English, the language is a candidate for inclusion. This is the case with the category of gender: in English the gender of nouns is natural, while in a great number of European languages it is grammatical. This difference gives each such language a positive point towards qualifying for the corpus.

2.6.2. Thus, the systemic and structural characteristics of a European language decide if it will be chosen. In the analysis

of the corpus, special attention will be paid to those categories in which a language differs from English, or in which English differs from the other languages. These are the main areas in which linguistic interference arises in the course of adaptation of loan-words and their integration into the system of the borrowing language.

2.6.3. This principle allows reducing the number of languages in the corpus. If two languages of one European branch show the same characteristics in comparison with English, only one will be chosen, not both. The one having some other qualifying feature will be perferred.

2.7. Although the above criterion seems rather all-embracing, it is by no means the only one, and would not be sufficient by itself. An important supplementary criterion is used in choosing from the four large groups — Germanic, Romance, Slavic, and Finno-Ugric.

2.7.1. In view of the numerical importance and the difference in structure of the four groups, we must take a typical representative of each group, one having a maximum of features common to that group and thus being the *most* Germanic, Romance, Slavic, or Finno-Ugric.

2.7.2. Also to be included, however, are the languages which deviate most from the common features of their group and are thus the *least* Germanic, Romance, Slavic, or Finno-Ugric. In the Romance group, for example, Italian is the most Romance and Rumanian the least Romance, and hence both go into the corpus according to these opposite characteristics.

2.8. The criterion of *intensity* and *length of contact* of a language with English can be one of the deciding factors. If a language has had *direct contact* with English in the past, and maintained it steadily until the present, without regard to changes in intensity, it is more qualified for inclusion in the corpus than another language whose contact has been less direct or of shorter duration and with interruptions.

2.8.1. A typical example of this criterion is French, which was the first of the European languages to come into direct contact with English, and which has kept up intense contact for many centuries, although there have been periods when the opposition to foreign words has also been strong. French enters the corpus as a Romance representative by the criterion of contact, rather than because of being typical of its group.

2.8.2. The same criterion chooses Dutch, among the Germanic languages. Because of its historical development and its constant

direct contact with English, Dutch can bring out elements which could not be found in the analysis of languages having had weaker, indirect, or shorter contacts with English.

2.9. Among the European languages there are some that assume a special position because of their *youth*, i. e. the recency of their standard form. This feature too can make a language qualify for the corpus. Such a language has been in contact with English only since the formation of its standard. This limits the time frame and enables a more synchronic analysis. This is the case, among others, with Macedonian.

2.9.1. Macedonian enters the corpus from among the Slavic languages because it is the youngest standard language in the group. Formed as a standard during the Second World War in Yugoslavia, it was declared the official language of the Macedonian republic in 1944, and then described and codified. In less than 40 years Macedonian has passed through the development which other languages have gone through in a much longer period. This makes it unique and offers us an exceptionally favourable opportunity to study the English element in the language, since we can follow the development from the very beginning.

2.10. Languages which are the only representatives in Europe of their groups should automatically go into the corpus. But here too one should not decide completely automatically, since this could lead to an unnecessary increase in the number of languages in the corpus without significant advantages. So we should consider the concrete contribution a language can make to the analysis. If we study Anglicisms in European languages seeking universal elements and establishing the conditions for universal phenomena, we will see that this basic criterion can be refined further before being applied.

2.10.1. Of the European languages that could enter the corpus according to this criterion, we will consider here Albanian, Basque, and Turkish. Features of interest to us divide them into two sets. The first contains Albanian and Turkish, which are so different in their systems from English that the analysis of their English element promises interesting results, while Basque goes in the second.

2.10.2. Basque is not included in the corpus, because the conditions for studying the English element in it are different from those in the other European languages, so that they would skew the results. Basque, surrounded by two mighty languages — French and Spanish — is so separated from English that the

conditions for contact and interference scarcely exist. This is the main reason for not including Basque.

2.10.3. But there are other reasons too: a) there is no unified Basque literary language, because of the political division between Spain and France; b) there may not even be the conditions for the dialects to group around one which would become a standard; c) political circumstances hinder normal linguistic development. The Spanish government opposes the use of Basque in education and public life, there are no Basque daily newspapers, Basque is not used on the radio, etc.

2.10.4. Albanian and Turkish are included by the above criterion, but also by some supplementary ones. Turkish is specially interesting for studying Anglicisms because it has to a large extent formed its vocabulary out of loans from many languages, including English. This would be sufficient reason to include it even aside from the main criterion of being the only representative of its group.

2.10.5. Albanian, too, is included because of several criteria. Besides being the only representative, as for Turkish, it fulfills two additional criteria: a) the criterion of youth, since it formed its standard in the recent past; b) it occurs in two environments under different conditions.

2.10.6. Criterion b) is important enough by itself to qualify a language for inclusion. It is applied whenever the English element in a language can be followed and studied under varying conditions. Such conditions arise when language X is spoken in two or more countries. In one, X is the official, national language and is not under the influence of some other language with greater prestige. In another, X is a national language, but there is another official language of greater prestige, which thus has an indirect influence on X.

2.11. We can observe this phenomenon in Yugoslavia in the case of Albanian in the region of Kosovo and in the Republic of Macedonia, and in the case of Hungarian in the region of Vojvodina. Traces might be found in the Italian of Istria and the Slovenian littoral.

2.11.1. The English element in Albanian can be studied in Albania and in Yugoslavia. Albanian in Kosovo is in close contact with Serbo-Croatian, and receives some borrowings through it. In the adaptation of these borrowings, some elements can be observed which are not seen in English borrowings in Albania. These elements are typical for the borrowing and adaptation of English words in Serbo-Croatian.

2.11.2. Similarly with Hungarian. Studying the English element in the Hungarian spoken in Yugoslavia, we notice certain phenomena not found in Hungarian in Hungary. These are presumably influenced by the English element in Serbo-Croatian, since this is the prestige language in the bilingual Hungarian and Serbo-Croatian area, just as in the bilingual Albanian and Serbo-Croatian region of Kosovo.

2.12. Special linguistic conditions in which certain European languages exist can be *negative criteria* for their inclusion. Thus Irish and Welsh are left out, since their relationship to English is different enough (from that of other European languages) as to seriously distort the resulting picture and hinder the drawing of universal conclusions about language contact. Homogeneity of conditions is a general postulate for the study of foreign elements in any group of receiving languages, and especially when the giving language is held constant. The importance of this postulate calls for special theoretical and methodological discussion.

2.12.1. Irish and Welsh are omitted according to the *criterion of environment,* that is, because it is very difficult to analyze the English element in them under the same conditions as in other European languages. While the relation of English (L_2) to language X (L_1) in most European countries is determined by the position of language X as official and national language of the country, with English as only one of many foreign languages, the relation is quite different in Ireland and Wales.

2.12.2. In Wales the receiving language (L_1) is the mother tongue of many Welshmen but not the official language, putting it in a special position with respect to the official and prestige language, English. Hence the relation is entirely different than in another European country, e. g. than L_1 German: L_2 English. The results obtained from analysis of Welsh could not go into a synthesis with results about the English element in other European countries.

2.12.3. The situation is similar, but not identical, in Ireland. Irish lives in name only, and only from recent times, as the official language of the country; in reality, it is in a position similar to that of Welsh, dominated by English. Irish results likewise would not be comparable with those from other countries. For the purposes of study of their English element, Irish and Welsh are in practically the same position as the native languages of European immigrants are in the U.S.A.[6]

[6] See p. 143, 3.2

3.0. *European languages.* The study of the criteria which a language should fulfill to be included in the corpus leads to a definition of the term *European language.* Although the adjective *European* might seem to define this concept sufficiently, it still calls for interpretation for the purposes of studying Anglicisms.

3.1. The first thing the concept *European language* might mean is a language spoken in Europe, in a European country, and belonging to a European people. The study of Anglicisms in such a language is determined by the relation of the language as borrower (L_1) to English, the lender (L_2). This is a relation between a foreign language, English, and a native language, which may in addition be the official language of the region.

3.2. But the concept *European language* can have another meaning for us. If we mean a language spoken by European immigrants or their descendants in the U.S.A., the situation with respect to English changes. Formally, the relation is the same: the European language is still the mother tongue (L_1) of the immigrants; but English is the national and official language of the country. The conditions for language contact have thus become different. Hence the study of Anglicisms or the English element in European languages in their new surroundings calls for different methods and promises different results. The new conditions will be reflected in the kind and extent of interference found at all levels.

3.3. Thus, a European language as borrower can come into contact with English in two environments and under two sorts of conditions:

1) The European language is the official and national language, and English is a foreign language.

2) English is the official and national language of the country. Here the other language is in a subordinate position and is exposed to constant strong influence.

3.4. Since most European languages, if not all, can find themselves in both situations, we must take the difference into account in studying foreign, especially English, elements in them. The conditions of the contact are decisive for its results, and must be investigated. Besides the *environment conditions,* mentioned above, attention must be paid to the *type of contact:* whether contact is oral or through writing, with which variant of English, directly or via an intermediary.

4.0. *The path of borrowings.* Elements of the lending language, English, may come in in two ways: a) directly, b) via an intermediary language. In both situations, there are two possible

media: oral and written. Each of the four combinations can influence the course of adaptation of a borrowing and its integration into the system of the new language. So each combination must be studied and its nature determined.

4.1. *Direct borrowing* appears when English comes into immediate contact with the receiving language, which is most frequent when a European country has direct realations with England. This is the case with France, whose relations have been close enough to be reflected on the level of language as well.

4.2. When we establish such contact, we then investigate whether the medium was *oral* or *written*. Each has its influence on the course of adaptation of the loan word and the determination of its form. In the oral medium, the phonological form of the loan will be under the influence of the English pronunciation. The written medium makes it depend on the spelling of the English word.

4.3. A large number of Anglicisms show *parallel forms*, which in many cases can be explained by the difference between the English spelling and pronunciation. One and the same word can appear in two or more forms:

Eng. *browning* > Croatian 1) *brauning*
2) *brovning, broving*

4.4. In the *written medium* of borrowing, *variations* appears: 1) the original English spelling, 2) a form adapted according to the borrowing-language orthographic system, 3) a spelling formed according to the English pronunciation.

E. *cowboy* > Cr. 1) *cowboy*
2) *kovboj*
3) *kauboj*

4.5. In *oral borrowing*, two variants of English may be involwed: *British* and *American*. In the transphonemization of English phonemes, the two sorts of pronunciation can give parallel forms of a word:

E. *boss* Br. /bɔs/ > Cr. *bos*
Am. /bɑːs/ > Cr. *bas*

4.6. This phenomenon is frequent in languages that have come into contact with the American variant of English since World War II through American soldiers and experts in Europe. German in West Germany abounds in such examples. In Croatia, such parallel forms appear in words which we have received from immigrants returned from the U.S. They pro-

nounce their English borrowing adapted according to the American variant.

5.0. *Intermediary languages.* The question of the etymology of an English loan in a European language is not answered when we have stated the medium of borrowing (written, oral) and the source variant of English. A third factor is whether the contact with English was direct or through an intermediary language.

5.1. In direct contact, whether written or aral, we analyze the adaptation of an English word as above, classifying the changes that take place during it as results of the factors mentioned: oral medium, written medium, British variant, American variant.

5.2. Words borrowed through an intermediary language pose a special problem. There are examples of Anglicisms in European languages whose path to the receiving language we cannot with certainty determine, though it is likely that there are only two solutions. The first is a *Central European reservoir* and the other an *intermediary language*. The two can be examined separately, but they are in fact connected.

5.3. The infiltration of English words into European languages notably increased in the 18th century as a result of the *discovery of England;* in the 19th and 20th centuries it becomes a literal invasion.

5.4. Two languages played an important role in carrying English words which later appeared in other European languag- Standing in the most favourable geographic position and cultural climate, they were the first to take in the rich deposit of English words which later appeared in other European languages as well.

5.5. Besides the possibility of transfer of English words into various European languages through an intermediary language, we can put forward the idea of a *Central European reservoir,* not limited in space or time. It would contain words from various European languages, including English. Each language contributed words for those concepts and objects which its civilization had given to general European civilization. When a borrowed concept or imported object had to be named, each language took the necessary word from this reservoir.

5.5.1. With the help of this *reservoir,* that is, through putting words in and taking them out, we can, it seems, explain certain phenomena in linguistic borrowing on the level of vocabulary.

On Page 145, in the paragraph 5.4. replace the second line:

13 English words which later appeared in other European lan

by: English words onto the Continent: French and German.

There are cases of borrowing of words which cannot be explained without it. For many loans, the origin cannot be found. Introducing an intermediary language helps but does not solve the problem completely.

5.6. English is a classical example of an *intermediary language*. In the not very distant past, English, coming into contact with non-European languages, served as intermediary for a large number of words from Asia, Africa, North and South America, and Australia. These words entered English, and, after being adapted and integrated into the English system, became a part of the vocabulary which English passed on to other European languages. They adapted so completely in form, often changing their meaning too, that it is hard to separate them from the English vocabulary. The average Englishman considers them English words, and they are transferred as such into other languages. Linguists determine their original etymologies, but in the European languages they are classified as English words, and behave like other English words when they pass into a particular language.

5.6.1. Can the same procedure be applied to English words known to have come into European languages through an intermediary (which has left its traces on them) rather than directly? Apparently not, since the examples found show that a difference nevertheless exists.

5.6.2. In studying Anglicisms and their etymologies, one should certainly try to establish the path they have taken from English to the receiving language. Finding the intermediary can help solve questions on some levels. In Croatian, for instance, we cannot establish the origin of the pronunciations *debl, kep,*[7] etc. without taking into account the role of German as an intermediary. The same is true on the morphological level when we study the shape of the citation form of verbs. While a large number of borrowed verbs make their infinitives by adding the suffixes, *-a, -ova,* or *-nu* and the ending *-ti* to the English base, part of them make infinitives with the suffix *-ir* which has come from German, and then add *-a* and *-ti*.

5.6.3. Such cases are frequent on the semantic level as well. It is obvious that the meanings of some English loans in

[7] English words *double* and *cup* have been adapted according to the principle mentioned in 4.4. and show two parallel forms in Croatian: *dabl — dubl* and *kap — kup*. However, under German influence they show a third form *debl* and *kep*. Cf. R. Filipović: *The Phonemic Analysis of English Loan-Words in Croatian*, Institute of Phonetics, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, 1960, pp. 41–42.

Croatian have been formed on the basis of an intermediary language. Cf. the meanings of *bar*, *smoking*, etc.

5.6.4. Thus it is not difficult to establish the role of an intermediary in the process of transfer of words from lending language to borrowing language. The intermediary function of French, German, Swedish, and other languages has been demonstrated, particularly that of French as an intermediary for English words in Italian, German for those in the Slavic languages, Swedish for Finnish, etc.

5.6.5. Should we, then rechristen all the English borrowings in European languages as borrowings from the intermediaries? In particular, should English words in Croatian, known to owe both meaning and phonetic and morphological form to an intermediary, be considered English loans or loans from the intermediary language?

5.6.6. The answer to this question is rather complex. There are linguists who would immediately re-classify such borrowings according to the intermediary language and not put them under English. Are they right? There are good arguments against them, in favour of retaining the origin of a loan-word, whatever its route into the receiving language.

5.6.7. We propose accepting as Anglicims all those words which can be determined to have English as their *language of origin* or denote an object or a concept of English origin. We even consider that Anglicisms can include *pseudo-Anglicisms* which have been formed within the receiving language out of elements of English origin. E. g. *best-runner*. While studying Anglicisms, one should investigate their route into the receiving language — direct or through an intermediary. If through an intermediary, how great is its influence on the phonological and morphological form of the word, and has its influence also changed the meaning? When analyzing Anglicisms on all levels, one should pay attention to the intermediary not in order to rename an Anglicism as some other sort of *-ism*, but because this information can help the analysis of any Anglicism, especially those which have departed from their English meaning during adaptation.

6.0. *Conclusion.* This contribution has not covered all the principles involved in the study of Anglicisms but only some of the fundamental ones. The first, and surely the most basic, is the question of the composition of a *corpus*. We have given a solution which has a certain theoretical justification. On the basis of this solution we have planned a corpus to be worked on by the project *The English Element in European Languag-*

es[8] which is analyzing the English element in 16 languages of Europe.[9]

6.1. Another question which we must solve in order to successfully study Anglicisms in European languages is the definition of *European language*. Whether we want to study European languages in Europe or as spoken by immigrants in the U.S., we have to agree on a definition, since the analysis and the results of the analysis depend on it. There are three points of view: we can study the English element a) in European languages in European countries, b) in European languages spoken by immigrants in the U.S., or c) in European languages wherever they are spoken, that is, a) plus b).

6.2. A third principle of which special account must be taken is the *path* and *manner* of borrowing. From the first moment of contact between the two languages up to the complete integration of a given word it can pass through various phases of adaptation, depending on the type of contact.

6.3. The form of a loan-word will depend on many factors, particularly on the *type of contact* and the *manner of borrowing*. Especially important is the problem of borrowing via an *intermediary* and the status of words borrowed in this way. The question is still under discussion; our proposal is to define the source of a borrowing as the original language, which means that all loan-words which are of English origin or whose meaning was adapted in England and shows its origin in English culture and civilisation, are Anglicisms.

6.4. When these basic questions are solved, or points of view on them adopted, the study of Anglicisms in European languages is organized according to general principles of languages in contact and linguistic borrowing. Here also some special problems arise, typical for the relation of English as lending language and the other European languages as receivers. These problems and general principles for Anglicisms in European languages are the starting point for our project *The English Element in European Languages*.[10]

---

[8] R. Filipović, "The English Element in the Main European Languages", *SRAZ*, 21—22, Zagreb, 1966, pp. 103—112. (The first report of the Project.)

[9] R. Filipović, "Some Problems in Studying the English Element in the Main European Languages" *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, IV, Poznań, 1972, 1—2, pp. 141—158. and in *English Studies Today* 5. Papers read at the eighth conference of the International Association of University Professors of English held at Istanbul, August 1973, pp. 25—52. (The second report of the Project.)

[10] See notes 8 and 9.